

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JERMAINE PALMER,	:	
Petitioner,	:	
	:	
v.	:	No. 2:24-cv-3110
	:	
KENNETH HOLLIBAUGH	:	
SUPT, SCI-SOMERSET; THE DISTRICT	:	
ATTORNEY OF THE COUNTY OF	:	
PHILADELPHIA; and THE ATTORNEY	:	
GENERAL OF THE STATE OF	:	
PENNSYLVANIA;	:	
Respondents.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 8th day of July, 2025, upon consideration of the petition for writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 and request to stay pending exhaustion, *see* ECF No. 2; the Response to the habeas corpus petition and request to stay, *see* ECF No. 21; the Report and Recommendation issued by Magistrate Judge Jose R. Arteaga on May 22, 2025, concluding that the habeas petition is untimely and successive, *see* ECF No. 22; and in the absence of objections;¹ **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

¹ When neither party objects to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, the district court is not statutorily required to review the report, under de novo or any other standard. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985). Nevertheless, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has held that it is better practice to afford some level of review to dispositive legal issues raised by the report. *Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987), *writ denied* 484 U.S. 837 (1987). “When no objections are filed, the district court need only review the record for plain error or manifest injustice.” *Harper v. Sullivan*, No. 89-4272, 1991 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2168, at *2 n.3 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 22, 1991). *See also Hill v. Barnacle*, No. 15-3815, 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 12370, at *16-17 (3d Cir. 2016) (holding that even when objections are filed, district courts “are not required to make any separate findings or conclusions when reviewing a Magistrate Judge’s recommendation de novo under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)”); *Oldrati v. Apfel*, 33 F. Supp. 2d 397, 399 (E.D. Pa. 1998) (explaining that in the absence of a timely objection, the court should review the magistrate judge’s report and

1. The Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 22, is **APPROVED and ADOPTED**.
2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus and request to stay, ECF No. 2, is **DISMISSED and DENIED**.
3. There is no basis for the issuance of a certificate of appealability.
4. The Clerk of Court shall **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joseph F. Leeson, Jr.
JOSEPH F. LEESON, JR.
United States District Judge

recommendation for clear error). The district court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).